



STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
BUREAU OF HIGHWAY DESIGN

**NHDOT Complete Streets Advisory Committee (CSAC) Meeting**

Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan Project Advisory Committee (PAC) Draft Minutes of  
January 22, 2020

**Attendees**

Alex Belenz – North Country Council/UVLSRPC  
Amanda-Joe W. Paulino – NHDOT Highway Des.  
Craig Tufts - CNHRPC (CSAC Chair)  
Dave Topham – GSW  
Doug Deaett - Upper Valley E-bike Initiative  
James Vayo – Southern NH Planning Commission  
Julie Chizmas City of Nashua  
Juliet Walker- City of Portsmouth (tel. conf.)  
Tim Dunn - NHDOT Highway Design

Kathleen Mullen – DHHS Public Health  
Larry Keniston – NHDOT Highway Design  
Leigh Levine – FHWA  
Sally Gunn – NHDOT  
Sam Durfee – City of Concord Planning Dept.  
Sandt Michener – NHDOT Federal Compliance  
Steve Workman – Transport NH (tel. conf.)  
Sylvia von Aulock – Southern NH Planning Comm.

**CSAC Notes:**

**6 Chip Seal Projects** (Tim Dunn)

Tim reported that the Department will advertise 6 Chip Seal projects for [the 2020 resurfacing program](#):

- 20416 Rindge, Cathedral Rd, 2.9 miles from NH 119 northerly to the Rindge/Jaffrey T/L.
- 20515 Dunbarton, Mansion/Stark/Winslow Rd, 4.0 miles from NH 13 northerly to NH 13.
- 20525 Mont Vernon, Francestown Tpk, 1.4 miles from NH 13 northerly to a P/J south of Dutton Circle.
- 20526 Mont Vernon, Amherst Rd, 0.4 miles from NH 13 southerly to the Amherst/Mount Vernon T/L.
- 21512 Dunbarton Everett Dam Rd, 1.2 miles from Mansion Rd westerly to the Weare/Dunbarton T/L.
- 21305 Moultonborough-Sandwich, NH 25, 4.0 miles from NH 171 in Moultonborough easterly to a P/J north of Vittum Hill Rd in Sandwich.

The 4-mile Dunbarton resurfacing project involving Mansion Road, Stark Lane and Winslow Road generated the most discussion from the Committee. Craig explained that the traverse is a popular bicycle route since it connects to NH 13 at both ends, yet allow cyclists to bypass the big hill where the Town of Dunbarton is located along NH 13. Craig also noted that the route is the temporary route that connects the Granite State Rail Trail (shared use path through New Hampshire envisioned to connect Methuen, MA with Hartford, VT). The Committee generally understood that Chip seals are a smart engineering treatment for certain roads that are already good condition and that traffic numbers along Dunbarton, Mansion/Stark/Winslow Rd were likely such that bicyclists would be frequently able to navigate in a wheel path along the highway surface where many bicyclists may find adequate service from the chip-sealed surface.

**E-Scooter discussion** (led by Julie)

- NASHUA: Julie Chizmas discussed the bike-share and E-scooter programs in Nashua. The Bike-Share service provider, VeoRide, began operating 200 bicycles in Nashua early in 2018. Users unlock the bicycles where they

find them and re-lock them when they've reached their destination. The lock and unlock actions are controlled by a smartphone app that users can download at no charge. Users scan the QR codes affixed to bicycle. This unlocks the bicycle and starts the timer. The rental charge is 50 cents for each 15 minutes. VeoRide works in conjunction with city's public transportation system and Julie has been working with the Department of Public Works toward marking off and striping more "bike space" on various roadways.

Nashua is a much smaller market than other markets where VeoRide operates and it took some time for the Company to agree to do business within the City. Julie explained that the bike share ran all winter the first year, albeit at a reduced capacity of 35 bicycles. The program exceeded expectations in 2018, logging 16,000 uses. In March of 2019, the City re-launched 200 bicycles but resolved to defer the program through the winter of 2019-2020.

At the beginning of the 2019 season, VeoRide also wanted to bring between 50 to 95 E-scooters to the City. Nashua commuters can now rent E-scooters from wherever they're found within the geo-fenced areas where earlier data had demonstrated demand. The scooters in 2019 were especially in demand, while the interest in bike-share waned.

The company pings the locations and status of the scooters remotely every 10 seconds while parked and every four minutes while being ridden. The scooters reach a speed of 15 miles per hour and have a battery life of about 35 miles. It's a dock-less system, so the scooters work independent of docking stations.

The scooter program doesn't cost the city anything. Riders activate the scooters with a mobile app and pay a \$1 unlock fee, and an additional 15 cents per minute. There were 45 scooters deployed at three points along Main Street at 10 a.m. on opening day, By midnight, VeoRide had tracked over 200 rides and the scooters were scattered throughout the city. Another 10 scooters were introduced later, with a total of 75 scooters deployed in 2019. VeoRide reported that Nashua was not a profitable market the first year, but by year two of the pilot program, they were profitable. Julie suggested that making the geo-fenced service area smaller and bringing in the "wildly popular" e-scooters turned the Program profitable for VeoRide in 2019 and the City may want to discuss revenue sharing at the end of the pilot program.

The City posts E-Scooter Safety information on the web page at <https://www.nashuanh.gov/DocumentCenter/View/16226/veo-ride-scooter?bidId>

- PORTSMOUTH: Juliet contributed that the vendor, Zagster, operates the [bicycle share system in Portsmouth](#). The City of Portsmouth partners with Zagster to provide a handful of bicycle docking stations around the core of the City. Sponsorship opportunities are available for local organizations to partner with Zagster to increase the number bike stations. As bicycle stations were added in most cases, but interest seemed to correlate with how much of a novelty the bike-share availability was to the new location. Stations stay out over winter December through march.
- MANCHESTER: James and Sylvia discussed [Bike Manchester's Bike Share](#). Manchester's Bike Share has had success with a dock system partly because of donations from large contributors. Although Zagster operates the system, Bike Manchester owns bicycles. (In more recent iterations of bike share, companies generally control all of the capital assets, including the bicycles.) A typical bike station with a capacity of a half-dozen bicycles costs about \$10,000 and Manchester's model has relied on donations in order to provide the bicycle stations. CMC, for example, made a one-time donation of \$10,000 to allow Zagster to own and control a bike station on their

property. Manchester recognizes that the current model is not sustainable and is considering the next phase, where a company comes in with their own assets and takes responsibility for the bicycles. Manchester on path toward a bike share and micromobility model with a system that will include 200 to 400 dock-less scooters plus dockless bicycles and Manchester will phase out the expensive docking stations. Sylvia noted that one of her staff had shared the article at <https://usa.streetsblog.org/2020/01/09/e-scooter-injuries/>, which may help to put E-scooter injuries into perspective.

- CONCORD: Sam contributed that the City of Concord is a [City of Villages](#) and the City is actively interested in seeing safe bike share and micro-mobility options available both within Concord's villages, between Concord's villages and job and residential centers scattered outside Concord's villages. Sam noted that the City of Concord is well aware of the pedestrian and bicycle accessibility issues related to connecting the City's downtown "village" with the City's heavily residential "heights" neighborhoods, which include high refugee and other potentially disadvantaged populations. Loudon Road is currently a barrier to meaningful access by pedestrians, bicyclists and those using micro-mobility devices. At this time, Concord Area Transit is exploring fare-free service connecting the Heights neighborhoods and downtown.
- UNH: Steve Pesci (contributed to the E-scooter discussion by email). A University transit and walking-oriented campus environment such as UNH is unique and E-scooters would create complications in the network. While students are excited about using an E-scooter, the costs of E-scooters (social, environmental, management, injury, safety) of scooters need to be fully accounted for.

Steve explained that bicycle use is encouraged on the campus but UNH has no formal policy on scooters at this point.

Important differences between campus bicycle use and campus scooter use are:

1. UNH #1 focus and priority is on the walking campus. The safety of the walking campus for all – especially those with disabilities (UNH has concerns about stray scooters becoming hazards for sight-impaired community. For bicycle infrastructure, UNH already has bike lanes, sharrow lanes and bicycle rack capacity for over 2,500 bicycles. Bicycles are required to be at racks and not left randomly in landscape or on stairways.
  2. The injury rate on e-scooters themselves is higher than that of bikes. See <https://www.ucsf.edu/news/2020/01/416396/urban-health-scare-e-scooters-show-alarming-spike-injuries> . E-scooters are creating more pedestrian conflicts on sidewalks etc. than bikes are in bike lanes/vehicle lanes.
  3. UNH transit operators are concerned with higher-than-pedestrian speed intrusions into the roadway network with scooters on and crossing roadways.
  4. State law regarding bike (and e-bike) use is clearly articulated but the law is not clear regarding the place for e-scooters.
  5. UNH buses all have bike racks. Although students can currently bring E-scooters on board, that would not work if the scooter numbers increase since the buses are already too crowded.
  6. UNH views bicycles as a mode for longer trips beyond scooter or walking domain, extending the accessibility of the walking and transit campus year round. Scooters are more seasonal with the likely peak season in the academic calendar being Sept-Nov and March-May.
- FHWA: Leigh Levine followed up the micromobility discussion via an email on 1/30/2020 sharing a recent USDOT posting on FHWA's website providing a micromobility case study from Santa Monica, CA: See

[https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/livability/case\\_studies/santa\\_monica/index.cfm](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/livability/case_studies/santa_monica/index.cfm) . The City of Santa Monica also recently published a Shared Mobility Pilot Program Summary Report with lessons-learned and recommendations for the future: See [https://www.smgov.net/uploadedFiles/Departments/PCD/Transportation/SantaMonicaSharedMobilityEvaluation\\_Final\\_110419.pdf](https://www.smgov.net/uploadedFiles/Departments/PCD/Transportation/SantaMonicaSharedMobilityEvaluation_Final_110419.pdf)

### **Upper Valley E-Bike Initiative (Doug)**

Doug Deaett of the [Upper Valley E-Bike Initiative](#) briefed the Committee about the E-bike Initiative now developing out of the Lebanon-Hanover-Hartford-Norwich “micropolitan” area. The Initiative is a research effort that will promote health and fitness while reducing traffic congestion by connecting commuters with electric bikes. The research effort is focused only on bicycles and will not involve, or be useful to, E-scooter programs such as Nashua’s successful program.

Doug noted that sustainable bike-share program may not be feasible for many of New Hampshire’s smaller population centers such as the Upper Valley area. Population centers like the Upper Valley are generally sprawling and commuting patterns may not be compatible with the bike-share model that may work for New Hampshire’s largest cities. Because Lebanon-Hanover-Hartford, VT-Norwich, VT (combined population 38,533) cannot offer the critical mass necessary for a viable bike share model, Doug is researching an alternative model to match Upper Valley commuters with electric bicycles, whereby a commuter can ultimately own a bicycle rather than “borrow” one.

Doug demonstrated the problem with a bike-share model for the Upper Valley in terms of a commuter who wants to rent a bicycle convenient to a micropolitan employment center in order to commute home. The commuter could potentially find near the employment center a vacant bicycle that will bring the commuter home. For most places where micropolitan commuters live, however, this would likely leave the bicycle far outside of the practical reach of other potential “borrowers.” In the unlikely event that another commuter can reach the vacated bicycle and borrow it, the first commuter will have no bicycle nearby home for to commute back to work. For practical purposes therefore, Doug explained that the bicycle must be owned by the commuter in micropolitan areas. Doug’s research program through the Upper Valley E-bike Initiative proposes to match commuters to an E-bike that best fits their specific needs in terms of user fitness, commute length, frequency of charging availability, etc. Then the Program will let commuters temporarily have exclusive use of the selected E-bike at nominal cost. If the E-bike turns out to adequately satisfy the commuter’s needs within an agreed-upon timeframe, the program will assist the commuter toward achieving full ownership of the E-bike. Doug hopes to reach conclusions about the viability of the arrangement on the basis of the inputs to, and results of, the Program.

Doug further explained that non-profit organizations typically don’t want to own bicycles because of liability, maintenance and other concerns for which many non-profits are not easily equipped. Therefore the “loan” phase of any program must involve an outfits such as a partnership between [Local Motion](#) and the [Upper Valley Transportation Management Association](#), which has already piloted a bicycle loaner program with 8 bicycles deployed in Hanover. For more information about the Upper Valley E-Bike initiative, see [Mission](#), [Trade name registration](#), [Bios](#).

### **Motorist/Bicyclist Rules and Safety Brochure Draft (Larry)**

Based on discussion at the meeting, the Department will incorporate several good comments to the [Motorist/Bicyclist Rules and Safety Brochure Draft](#) . The comments included updating the Alt. Right Turn image to show the extended right arm horizontal with the hand fully exposed, avoiding some potential confusion from punctuation around the internet reference to <https://bwanh.org/e-bikes> , enlarging the NHDOT and BWANH logos so that the smaller text within the

logos can be read and revising the explanation of shared use lanes to include the common name for the marking (“sharrow.”)

**Bicycle-Friendly Driver** Class piloting at NHDOT - update (Sally)

Sally announced that the Department will pilot a [Bicycle-Friendly Driver](#) class. The class will involve Highway Design Staff. Based on the reception, one other class may follow. Depending on the success of the classes, the Department may consider bringing the class to other NHDOT bureaus.

**LTS pilot [Incorporating Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress into MPO Performance Based Planning](#) - update** (Scott Bogle)

In his Scott’s absence, Scott sent an email to update the Committee: *The planning commissions continue to work on how best to incorporate the LTS data into project prioritization. Rockingham Planning Commission and Plymouth State are working on the final report. FHWA probably to hold peer sharing webinars in February, 2020.*

**Legislative Update** (Dave Topham)

[HB-1426](#): would require testing of rail trails for potential toxins and dust before opening to OHRV traffic

[HB-1165](#): banning OHRVs on a Gorham rail trail section

[HB-148](#): New Hampshire E-bike laws have generated new legislation this year

[SB-436](#): Increases penalties for serious crashes caused by distracted driving

[HB-1617](#): Also concerns increasing fines for distracted driving but lower penalties than SB-436

[HB-1621](#): Concerning mandatory helmet use for all bicyclists, moped drivers, and motorcyclists for all ages

[HB-1438](#): Relative to accommodating access for registered OHRVs on lower-speed public highways

[HB-683](#): Relative to the rights of property owners abutting certain highways and rail trails. Dave noted that a drone video demonstrating the issue from some rail trail abutters’ perspectives has been released and can be accessed at [https://www.dropbox.com/s/uciidm29y2waed1/RideTheNeighborhoods-FINAL-012120 .mp4?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/s/uciidm29y2waed1/RideTheNeighborhoods-FINAL-012120.mp4?dl=0) .

**Statewide Rail Trail Plan Update** (Sally)

Following up on Scott Bogle’s question about the [Statewide Rail Trail Plan](#) Committee’s Homeowner Representative, Sally reported that the Homeowner representative has not yet been identified.

**CSAC Bylaws** (Craig)

Larry distributed the CSAC [bylaws](#). Please review as we’ll want to discuss the bylaws in an upcoming meeting.

**Alex Belenz is transitioning out of NCC to UVLSRPC** (Alex)

Over the next several weeks, Alex will move from the North Country Council to the Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission. To the extent that UVLSRPC wishes to continue Alex’ participation on the Committee, Alex is willing to continue to serve on the Committee.

**Approval of December 18, 2019 Meeting Minutes**

The Committee approved the CSAC/PAC [December 18, 2019 Meeting Minutes](#)

PAC Notes

**CSAC/PAC Preview of planning documents** (Larry)

For the December 18 meeting, Alta had already delivered to NHDOT:

Since CSAC/PAC last met on December 18, Alta has provided 4 additional documents to NHDOT for PAC preview:

- [NH Connectivity maps](#)
- [Draft Recommended Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Network](#) \*
- [Draft NHSPB Network Connectivity Tables by RPC](#) \*\*
- [Draft Economic Impact Analysis memo](#)

*\*To show how the NH Connectivity maps will develop into the Statewide Network Recommendations maps, Phil provided this [slide](#). These are Alta's temporary maps that show the draft statewide pedestrian and bicycle network, divided into multi-colored corridors of varying lengths that provide connections between communities and key destinations. The draft network is an outgrowth of the Connectivity/gap Analysis that was developed throughout the spring and summer 2019, and then revised in the fall based on comments from the online input map and at the outreach events (both public meetings and farmer's market booths).*

*There is no specific criteria for each of the 272 corridors' extents, only that the network is divided into a series of logical links that Alta may incorporate into the Prioritization methodology.*

*A few things to note about the recommended statewide network maps:*

- *for context, both existing and planned/funded off-road trails are shown, but only on-road corridors that form the statewide network are labeled*
- *the map legend is only to identify existing and planned/funded corridors only (most trails), the various colors used for the network corridors are arbitrary*
- *these are rough maps exported directly from GIS...when finalized, they will be done in Illustrator and have a similar look-and-feel as the other maps*
- *corridors are encapsulated within each RPC, so some logical corridors--e.g. Keene to Nashua--are cut in two pieces (Keene to Temple in SWRPC and Wilton to Nashua in NRPC) so that each individual corridor resides within a single RPC boundary*

*\*\*Each corridor is labelled and also included in the linked tables, conveniently separated for each RPC.*

**Next CSAC/PAC Meeting** (all)

CSAC will next meet on *Wednesday February 26, 2020 at 1:00 in the NHDOT John O. Morton Building, Highway Design Conference Room 211*. Call-in option will be made available. In the meantime, please forward your agenda items to [Craig](#) and [Larry](#).

Adjourn meeting (Craig)